

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 19-24 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 17, 20, 23, and 24 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-5 of the Reply. Claim 6 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview on July 30, 2007, between Le V. Nguyen and Applicants' representative Bradley D. Spitz. During the interview, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10, 12-17, 19-21, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 was discussed. Regarding said rejection, it was asserted by the Examiner that Moehrle (U.S. 7,191,411) discloses direct cycling between a semi-collapsed view and at least a second view at col. 5, ll. 1-11, of said reference. Further, potential amendments to independent claims 1, 17, 20, 23, and 24 were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10, 12-17, 19-21 and 24 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10, 12-17, 19-21 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Moehrle (U.S. 7,191,411). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. The cited reference does not disclose or suggest all features recited in the subject claims as amended.

For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that “*each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (*quoting Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)) (emphasis added).

Amended independent claim 1 (and its corresponding dependent claims) recites: *A system that facilitates access to data comprising: a set component that identifies sets of data; and, a display component that displays at least one data set in a semi-collapsed view and directly cycles through the semi-collapsed view, a collapsed view, and an expanded view of the at least one data set.* The subject amendments are supported by the specification. For example, the specification discloses that a user can cycle between

expanded, semi-collapsed, and collapsed views of a data set by repeatedly clicking a single button. (See p. 5, ll. 14-15; p. 6, ll. 22-23).

Moehrle relates to techniques for expedited browsing of a multi-level hierarchical collapsing menu structure. (See abstract; col. 2, ll. 28-29). As a user selects items to navigate through a hierarchical menu, the selected items are displayed as “active links” in an “Active Path.” (See col. 2, ll. 33-41). Active links in the Active Path can be subsequently selected to facilitate direct access to a corresponding level or item of the hierarchical menu without requiring re-navigation through the menu. (See col. 2, ll. 41-44). Further, Moehrle discloses that a user can roll over an active link with a cursor to display sibling items in a level of the hierarchical menu corresponding to the active link. (See col. 5, ll. 4-9; fig. 5C).

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner interprets the Active Path and active links therein disclosed by Moehrle as a semi-collapsed view of a data set. Further, as noted in the Office Action and during the telephonic interview conducted between the Examiner and Applicants’ representative on July 30, 2007, the Examiner interprets the act of rolling over an active link in the Active Path with a cursor to display sibling items in a level of a hierarchical menu corresponding to the active link as a direct cycling between a semi-collapsed view and at least a second view of a data set. However, amended independent claim 1 recites *a display component that displays at least one data set in a semi-collapsed view and directly cycles through the semi-collapsed view, a collapsed view, and an expanded view of the at least one data set*. The cited reference does not teach or suggest such features.

Moehrle discloses that a user can roll over an active link in an Active Path with a cursor to reveal sibling menu items located at a level of a hierarchical menu corresponding to the active link. By rolling over the active link with a cursor and then removing the cursor from the active link, cycling can be achieved between display of the active link alone and display of the active link with its sibling menu items. However, the techniques disclosed by Moehrle allow cycling of only these two views and do not allow direct cycling through a semi-collapsed view, a collapsed view, and an expanded view as recited by independent claim 1.

Independent claims 17, 20, and 24 have been amended in a similar manner to independent claim 1. Thus, Moehrle does not disclose or suggest all features of said claims for the reasons stated above. In view of the foregoing, Moehrle does not disclose or suggest all features recited in the subject claims. Accordingly, Applicant's representative respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 3, 8 and 9 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle (U.S. 7,191,411) in view of Screen Dumps of Microsoft Windows XP ("MS XP"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks directed to independent claim 1 above, from which these claims depend.

III. Rejection of Claim 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle (U.S. 7,191,411). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks directed to independent claim 1 above, from which this claim depends.

IV. Rejection of Claim 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle (U.S. 7,191,411) in view of Screen Dumps of East ("East"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks directed to independent claim 20 above, from which this claim depends.

V. Rejection of Claim 23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle (U.S. 7,191,411) in view of Screen Dumps of IE ("IE"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. Independent claim 32 has been amended in a similar manner to independent claim 1 to recite *a first field comprising information associated with at least one data set to be displayed in a semi-*

collapsed view, a collapsed view, or an expanded view, the view displayed determined by a direct cycling. In light of the remarks directed to independent claim 1 above, Moehrle does not disclose or suggest all features recited in independent claim 23. Further, IE is silent as to direct cycling through semi-collapsed, collapsed, and expanded views of a data set as recited by independent claim 23. For these reasons, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all limitations of independent claim 23. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP523US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
Amin, Turocy & Calvin, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

Amin, Turocy & Calvin, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731